UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/574,021  | 03/23/2006  | Herbert Brunner      | 502902-227PUS       | 8034             |  |
| 27799 7590 05/20/2009<br>COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP<br>551 FIFTH AVENUE |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | WALFORD, NATALIE K  |                  |  |
| SUITE 1210<br>NEW YORK, NY 10176  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |             |                      | 2879                |                  |  |
|   |             |                      |                     |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |             |                      | 05/20/2009          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Interview Summary  | 10/574,021 BRUNNER ET AL.   |   | .L.                                    |
|--|---|---|--|
| interview Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |
|  | NATALIE K. WALFORD  | 2879  |  |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO   | personnel):   |   |  |
| (1) <u>NATALIE K. WALFORD</u> .  | (3)   |   |  |
| (2) <u>Brad Marazas</u> .  | (4)   |   |  |
| Date of Interview: 18 May 2009.  |   |   |  |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2   | t)∏ applicant's representative  | ·]  |  |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:  | e) No.  |   |  |
| Claim(s) discussed:  |   |   |  |
| Identification of prior art discussed:   |   |   |  |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g   | )□ was not reached. h)□ N   | I/A.  |  |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>The applicant's represent was an improper 102 (e)</u> . The Examiner agreed to issue a (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER.   | tative and Examiner discussed new office action.  ments which the examiner agony of the amendments that was also considered.  CTION MUST INCLUDE THE last Office action has already | reed would render the SUBSTANCE Could been filed, APP | er the claims claims  OF THE LICANT IS |
| INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFICE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE SUBSTA | ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, <sup>1</sup>   | WHICHEVER IS  | LATER, TO                              |
|  |   |   |  |
|  |   |   |  |
|  |   |   |  |
|  |   |   |  |
|  |   |   |  |
| ı  | /NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/  |   |  |
|  | Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art U  | nit 2879  |  |

Application No.

Applicant(s)